

1 DANIEL I. HALIMI (SBN: 302872)
2 **HALIMI LAW FIRM**
3 1455 Frazee Rd., Suite 500
4 San Diego, California 92108
5 (855) 453-2946
6 daniel@halimilawfirm.com

7 Attorney for Plaintiff Jack Stanbury

8
9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
10 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
11

12 JACK STANBURY, an individual,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.
15

16 DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

17 Defendants.
18
19

Case No.: 3:21-cv-01922-SK

**PLAINTIFF JACK STANBURY'S
CASE MANAGEMENT
STATEMENT**

Hearing Date: 6/21/2021

Hearing Time: 1:30 p.m.

Judge: Hon. Sallie Kim

20
21 Plaintiff Jack Stanbury submits the following Case Management Statement.

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///
25
26
27
28

1. JURISDICTION

This Court has diversity jurisdiction over this matter under 28 U.S.C., §1332 because the amount in controversy is more than \$75,000.00, because Plaintiff Jack Stanbury is a citizen of a foreign state (a United Kingdom citizen residing in Spain), and because, based on information and belief, the Defendants are citizens of the United States.

Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because Coinbase, Inc., through which a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claim occurred and which holds much of the evidence in this matter, is located in the Northern District of California.

2. SERVICE

This case is initiated against Defendants currently unknown who are believed to reside in the United States (the “Unknown Defendants”). The identity of the Unknown Defendants is currently only known to Coinbase, Inc. – where the Unknown Defendants held accounts and through which the Unknown Defendants stole Plaintiff’s assets.

Plaintiff and his counsel have informally and formally attempted to identify the Unknown Defendants through Coinbase, Inc. Initially, Coinbase indicated that it would cooperate with the Plaintiff upon receipt of a subpoena. Plaintiff issued a subpoena to Coinbase seeking the identity of the Unknown Defendants on April 17, 2021 and on May 7, 2021.

Coinbase has since refused to respond to the subpoena because a Rule 26(f) conference has not yet taken place. Yet, without a response to the subpoena, the Unknown Defendants cannot be identified for service of the summons. Plaintiff requests that this Court permit service of the subpoena under FRCP Rule 26(d)(1). If the Court prefers, Plaintiff will submit a separate application for the same.

///

///

1 **3. FACTS AND LEGAL ISSUES**

2 This case concerns the conversion of Plaintiff's Bitcoin cryptocurrency currently
3 worth approximately \$1,560,621.54. The Unknown Defendants who converted
4 Plaintiff's assets transferred the stolen assets to their own accounts at Coinbase.
5 Plaintiff seeks to uncover the identity of the Unknown Defendants and will amend
6 the Complaint to name the Unknown Defendants once their identity is discovered
7 through Coinbase.

8 **4. MOTIONS**

9 Plaintiff anticipates filing a motion to conduct early discovery under FRCP
10 Rule 26(d)(1).

11 **5. AMENDING THE COMPLAINT**

12 Plaintiff anticipates amended the complaint once Plaintiff discovery the
13 identity of the Unknown Defendants.

14 **6. EVIDENCE PRESERVATION**

15 The submitting party, Jack Stanbury, has reviewed the Guidelines for the
16 Discovery of Electronically Stored Information.

17 **7. INITIAL DISCLOSURES**

18 The parties have no yet sent each other Initial Disclosures. Plaintiff
19 anticipates exchanging Initial Disclosures once the Unknown Defendants are
20 identified and named in an amended complaint.

21 **8. DISCOVERY**

22 Plaintiff will seek to discover the identity of the Unknown Defendants via
23 subpoena to Coinbase and also seek information as to the receipt of assets stolen
24 from the Plaintiff.

25 **9. CLASS ACTION**

26 Not applicable.

27 **10. RELATED CASES**

28 Plaintiff is not aware of any related cases.

1 **11.RELIEF SOUGHT**

2 Plaintiff seek compensatory damages for the value of assets the Unknown
3 Defendants converted from Plaintiff's account.

4 **12.SETTLEMENT AND ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTIONS**

5 The parties have not tried to settle the case. Plaintiff anticipates settlement
6 discussion will begin once the Unknown Defendants are identified are served.

7 **13.CONSENT TO HAVE A MAGISTRATE JUDGE HEAR THE CASE**

8 Plaintiff has consented to a magistrate judge.

9 **14.NARROWING OF ISSUES, CLAIMS, OR DEFENSES**

10 Not applicable.

11 **15.EXPEDITATED TRIAL PROCEDURE**

12 Not applicable.

13 **16.SCHEDULING**

14 Plaintiff agrees to have the Court set deadlines.

15 **17.TRIAL**

16 Plaintiff anticipates a three-day trial by a judge.

17 **18.DISCLOSURE OF NON-PARTY INTERESTED PERSONS OR**
18 **ENTITIES**

19 None.

20 **19.OTHER MATTERS**

21 None.

22
23 DATED: June 18, 2021

HALIMI LAW FIRM

24
25 By: 

26 Daniel I. Halimi
27 Attorney for Plaintiff Jack Stanbury
28